DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 310 PS 009 419

AUTHOR	Atkins, Janice; Goodwin, Judy
TITLE	Report of Supportive Services and Parent Involvement in Follow Through in Philadelphia, 1975-1976.
INSTITUTION	Philadelphia School District, Pa. Office of Research and Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	77123
PUB DATE	Mar 77
GRANT	OEG-G-007-502-171
NOTE	45p.; For related documents, see PS 009 418 and PS 009 420
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; Dental Health; Elementary Education; *Health Services; *Parent Participation; *Primary Education; *Program Evaluation; Psychological Services; *Social Services
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

This document, part of a series of reports on The Philadelphia Follow Through Expansion Program, describes the level of medical, dental, psychological and social service and parent involvement in the 18 schools involved in the project. Each section includes a description of services to the total program, and discusses the attainment of Title I objectives which are mandated for programs receiving Title I funds, followed by a more detailed description of the services at the individual school level. The principal finding is that due to declining enrollment and increased costs over the years combined with same funding, the level of supportive services to Follow Through children has been gradually decreasing. Appendices include data sheets on the various services. (MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142310

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

REPORT OF SUPPORTIVE SERVICES AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN FOLLOW THROUGH IN PHILADELPHIA 1975-1976

Report Prepared by:

Janice Atkins
and
Judy Goodwin

of the

Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Report Number 77123

Grant Number G 007 502 171

March, 1977

Leontine D. Scott
Director
Follow Through Program

Thomas C. McNamara
Manager
Early Childhood Evaluation Unit

Constance E. Clayton
Executive Director
Early Childhood Programs

Irvin J. Farber
Assistant Director
Priority Operations
Evaluation Services

Michael H. Kean
Executive Director
Office of Research and Evaluation

PS 009419

OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA

DISCLAIMER

The activity which is the subject of this report regarding the original, national Follow Through Program was supported in whole or in part by the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Arthur W. Thomas, President

Mrs. Edward Oberholtzer, Vice President

Mr. Augustus Baxter

Mrs. Lawrence Boonin

Mr. George Hutt

Robert M. Sebastian, Esq.

Mrs. Michael Stack

George Philip Stahl, Jr., Esq.

****

Dr. Michael P. Marcase, Superintendent of Schools, Secretary and Treasurer

Dr. Robert L. Poindexter, Executive Deputy Superintendent

****

Dr. I. Ezra Staples
Deputy Superintendent for
Instructional Services

Mr. Thomas C. Rosica
Executive Director
Federal Programs

FOLLOW THROUGH DISTRICT LIAISON ASSISTANTS

District 1	James Gaskins
District 2	Gerri Walker
District 3	Floyda Marcus
District 4	Shirley McGill
District 5	Flossie Allen
District 6	Marie Tervalon

The School District of Philadelphia
Follow Through Schools and Principals

1975-76

Schools	Principals
Arthur School 20th and Catharine Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19103	Mr. Murray Ginsburg
Duckrey School 15th and Diamond Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19121	Mr. Sylvester Webb
Dunbar School 12th Street and Columbia Ave. Philadelphia, Penna. 19122	Mr. Eugene Strolle
Drew School 38th Street and Powelton Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19104	Mrs. Franzella Buchanan
Elverson School 13th Street and Susquehanna Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19133	Mr. Albert Norrell
Ferguson School 7th and Norris Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19122	Mrs. Sadie Mitchell
Fulton School Haines Street and Germantown Ave. Philadelphia, Penna. 19144	Mr. Jesse DiTeodore
Harrison School 11th and Thompson Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19122	Mr. William C. Williams
J.B. Kelly School Pulaski Avenue and Hansberry Street Philadelphia, Penna. 19144	Mr. William Seiberlich
Ludlow School 6th and Master Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19122	Mr. Charles Day

Follow Through Schools	Principals
McMichael School 36th Street and Fairmount Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19104	Mr. John A. Watson
Nebinger School 6th and Carpenter Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19147	Miss Dahlia Johnson
Pratt-Arnold School 22nd Street and Susquehanna Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19132	Mr. Elliot Jacoby
E.M. Stanton School 17th and Christian Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19146	Mr. Vernon Jones
Kearny School 6th Street and Fairmount Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19122	Mr. James P. Kane
Waring School 18th and Green Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19130	Mrs. Felicita Hanna
A. Wilson School 46th Street and Woodland Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19143	Mr. Stanford James
J. Wister School Wakefield and Bringhurst Streets Philadelphia, Penna. 19144	Mrs. Barbara A. Daly

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
MEDICAL SERVICES	2-4
DENTAL SERVICES	5-7
PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES	8-11
SOCIAL SERVICES	12-14
PARENT INVOLVEMENT	15-18
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	19-20
APPENDIX	21

INTRODUCTION

The following report describes the level of medical, dental, psychological and social services, and parent involvement in the eighteen Follow Through schools in Philadelphia in 1975-1976. The data were collected on a quarterly basis using forms developed by the local evaluation staff (see Appendix).

Each section includes a description of services to the total program, and discusses the attainment of Title I objectives, which are mandated for programs receiving Title I funds, followed by a more detailed description of services at the individual school level. The format below is utilized for each section:

A. Total Program

B. Title I Objectives

C. Services at the Individual School Level

ABSTRACT

This report is based on data collected from quarterly recording forms in the four major supportive service areas: medical, dental, psychological, social. The forms were developed by the evaluation staff and were completed by school personnel. In many instances, however, only incomplete information was supplied.

The principal finding is that due to declining enrollment and increased costs over the years combined with same funding, the level of supportive services to Follow Through children has been gradually decreasing.

Health services data indicate that approximately 62% of the Follow Through population was screened for medical and dental problems, and that 51% of those referred for medical care received treatment, while 44% of those referred for dental care received treatment.

Information regarding psychological services indicates that 5% (N=363) of the Follow Through population was referred to psychological personnel and that 275 children (76% of those referred) received direct psychological services. Additional indirect services were provided through staff development for teachers.

Social services information indicates that while fewer Follow Through School Community Coordinators were hired on a full-time basis in 1975-1976, the number of home visits for the year totaled 8,770 and 87% of those families who were in need of help, received help.

Parent involvement data indicate that across the program, 401 additional parents helped their respective school's Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)

monthly in planning parent involvement activities. At 9 of the 18 schools over 70% of the Follow Through parent population attended at least one meeting or affair during the year, and a total of 19,615 parent volunteer hours were donated to the program. This represents a considerable decrease over the number of volunteer hours in 1974-1975.

MEDICAL SERVICES[1]

A. Total Program

In the 1975-1976 year, 14 of 18 Follow Through schools were contracted for medical services as compared with 16 in previous years. The kinds of services performed were diagnostic and therapeutic. Various immunizations were also given. Unfortunately, complete information for the year was made available for only 8 schools (and partial information for the remaining 10 schools). This is because School Health Services advised that school health staff were assigned special additional responsibilities regarding the inoculation of children and therefore, were unable to regularly complete the Follow Through data forms. The following data, therefore, underestimate the level of medical services to Follow Through children. Of the 7011 students enrolled in the total program, an average of 64% were screened for medical problems, 18% (1,254 children) were referred for care and 634 children (51% of those referred) were treated. With the exception of one school, children were not escorted by school personnel to medical services, and transportation services were not provided this year.

B. Title I Objectives

Of the 17 schools which provided information on the number of children screened, 2 succeeded in meeting the screening criterion which stipulated that 100% of the school's Follow Through population be screened. Fourteen schools partially satisfied this criterion with percentages ranging from 55 to 99%. The remaining school did not meet this criterion.

Of the 15 schools which provided referral and treatment figures, 4 succeeded in meeting the second criterion which stipulated that 80% of

[1] All results reported in this section can be found in Table 1 of the Appendix.

those children referred by the school nurse for medical problems would be treated by contracted or non-contracted agencies. Seven schools partially satisfied the criterion with percentages ranging from 44 to 69%. The remaining 4 schools did not satisfy this criterion.

C. Contracted and Non-Contracted Services

The Arthur and E.M. Stanton Schools

There is no formal Follow Through contract with Rebound Medical Group, Inc., because all children at Arthur and E.M. Stanton are eligible for free health services under Title V funds. No information was made available for the E.M. Stanton school, but at Arthur an average of 56% of the children were screened for medical problems and the seven children referred to Rebound were treated.

The Drew, McMichael and Wilson Schools

Medical services for these three schools were not contracted with Presbyterian Hospital until the end of May. Consequently, virtually no service, if any, was provided. Screening information indicates that 64 to 89% of the children were screened for medical problems, and that 35 children at McMichael were being treated by non-contracted agencies.

The Duckrey, Dunbar, Elverson, Ferguson, Harrison and Pratt-Arnold Schools

Jefferson Hospital was contracted to provide medical services to these six Follow Through schools. One of the agency's objectives is to provide Early and Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment Services as part of Title XIX. Towards this end, a pediatrician came once a week to the six schools. Once again incomplete information is available for four of the schools which reported for six months only. The percentage of children screened at the schools ranged from a high of 88% to a low of 48%,

and percentages of those referred who were treated, ranged from 80% to 29%.

The Fulton, Kelly and Wister Schools

Covenant House is contracted to provide medical services to these three schools. Services include evening and week-end telephone consultations by a pediatrician and examinations for children not previously examined. The percentage of children screened at the three schools ranged from 35% to 70% and the percentages of those referred who were treated ranged from 18% to 100%.

The Kearny and Waring Schools

These two schools did not have contracted medical services, but utilized Health Centers in their immediate neighborhood. At Kearny, 62% of the children were screened for medical problems and 10% of those referred were treated. At Waring, 100% of the children were screened, and 52% of those referred were treated.

The Ludlow School

Ludlow received contracted medical services from St. Lukes Children's Medical Center. Among the services offered were physical examinations, referrals to specialty services, and laboratory screening tests. Information was again made available for only six months. Figures for this period of time indicate that an average of 54% of the children were screened for medical problems and 96% of those referred were treated.

DENTAL SERVICES[1]

A. Total Program

Eleven of the 18 Follow Through schools contracted dental services this year as compared with 13 in the previous year. The kinds of services performed were mainly preventive and restorative. As with medical services information is incomplete for six schools where only six months were reported, and no information was made available for four additional schools, i. e., complete information exists for only eight schools in the program. On the basis of this information, 4,298 children (61%) were screened for dental problems, 1670 (24%) were referred for care and of these 742 (44%) were treated for dental problems. It was reported that 370 children were escorted by school personnel to dental services and that 130 children were provided with transportation.

B. Title I Objectives

Of the 13 schools which provided information on the number of children screened, three succeeded in meeting the first criterion which stipulated that 100% of the school's Follow Through population would be screened for dental problems. Eight schools partially fulfilled this requirement with percentages ranging from 62 to 94%. The remaining two schools did not satisfy the criterion.

Of the 14 schools which provided referral and treatment figures, seven schools succeeded in meeting the second criterion which stipulated that 80% of those children referred to dental services would be treated. The percentages for these seven schools ranged from 98% to 100%. Two schools

1. All results reported in this section can be found in Table 2 of the Appendix.

partially satisfied the criterion with percentages of 50 and 55% respectively. The remaining five schools did not satisfy the criterion.

C. Contracted and Non-Contracted Services

The Arthur and E.M. Stanton Schools

As with medical services, there is no formal contract with Rebound Medical Group, Inc., but all children at Arthur and E.M. Stanton are eligible for free dental services. No screening or treatment figures were available for E.M. Stanton, but 130 children (32%) were referred for care. On the basis of information for a 6 month period, 94% of the Arthur school's Follow Through population was screened for dental problems, 5% (14 children) were referred for care, and treated.

The Drew, McMichael and Wilson Schools

These three schools contracted the services of the University of Pennsylvania Hospital late in the school year. No information was made available by the Drew School, and only 6 months were reported by the McMichael School. At Wilson, 72% of the children were screened for dental problems, but only 9 children were referred for care and 5 children received treatment. At McMichael, 63% of the children were screened for dental problems, 25% (129) were referred for care but only 15 children received treatment.

The Dunbar, Elverson, Harrison and Ludlow Schools

These four schools contracted dental services with a private dentist at Girard Dental Center. Information for Elverson and Harrison was made available for only a six month period. The percentage of children screened at these schools (with the exception of

Harrison (which did not provide screening information) ranged from 49 to 84%, and the percentage of children referred for dental problems ranged from 20% to 49%. Treatment figures indicate that 50% to 100% of those children referred were under care.

The Duckrey, Ferguson, Kearny, Pratt-Arnold and Waring Schools

These schools did not have contracted services, but utilized dental clinics in their immediate neighborhoods. Incomplete information was available for both Kearny and Waring. However, on the basis of the information reported, the percentage of children screened at each of these schools ranged from 48% to 100%, and the percentage of children referred ranged from 29% to 59%. Of these children, 8% to 100% were under dental care.

The Fulton, Kelly and Wister Schools

These schools contracted dental services with private dentists. However, at Fulton and Kelly dental services were cancelled before the 1975 year ended, and dental services did not resume until June. No information was provided for the Kelly and Wister schools. At Fulton, 100% of the children were screened for dental problems, but only 3% (13 children) were referred for care and received treatment.

The Nebinger School

Dental services were contracted with Southeast Neighborhood Health Center (as were medical services). Seventy-five percent of the children were screened for dental problems, 17% were referred for care, and 98% of those referred were treated.

PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES[1]

A. Total Program

Due to budgetary allocations requiring the shifting of funds to meet increased personnel costs, psychological services were minimal in the 1975-1976 year. Although 13 of the 18 Follow Through schools contracted psychological services this year as compared with 9 in the previous year, fewer children received direct services. Of the 7011 children in the program, 363 were referred to psychological personnel and 79% of those children examined were under care. In addition, 195 parents were seen by psychological personnel.

B. Title I Objectives

Of the 15 schools which provided information on psychological services for part or all of the school year, four schools met both criteria which stipulated that: i) at least 80% of those pupils referred would be examined by either contracted or non-contracted agencies, and ii) 100% of those children examined would receive treatment or consultation. In addition, 4 schools met the first criterion, and 4 other schools met the second criterion. The remaining 3 schools met neither criterion. It should be noted that in most schools very few children were referred for psychological services.

C. Contracted and Non-Contracted Services

Bank Street: Dunbar, Elverson and E. M. Stanton Schools

Dunbar and Elverson received contracted psychological services from

1. All results reported in this section can be found in Table 3 of the Appendix.

a private consultant. Observations were made of children who were referred (14 at Dunbar and 20 at Elverson) and conferences were held with the teacher, counselor and staff who worked directly with the child. Where necessary, children were referred to outside agencies for further help. E. M. Stanton had no contracted services and did not provide information on the utilization of non-contracted agencies.

Behavior Analysis: Arthur, Duckrey and Pratt-Arnold Schools

Psychological services are generally not contracted in this model, because it is felt that psychological safe-guards are built into the model and that most problems can be handled within its parameters.

However, at Pratt-Arnold, Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute provides an in-kind contribution for family treatment, and approximately 15 families were helped in this way.

Bilingual: Ferguson, Ludlow and Waring Schools

Ferguson and Waring received contracted psychological services from the Institute for Learning, which provided observation and evaluation, as well as training for teachers and counselors in developing remedial prescriptions for children and effective follow-up routines. Workshops were also provided for parents. Sixteen children at Ferguson and 18 children at Waring were seen on an individual basis and were under consultation or treatment.

The Ludlow School contracted the services of Temple University's

School Psychology Department. Interns observed, tested and reevaluated both individual and groups of students. Of the 86 students referred, 67% were examined and under treatment or consultation. According to the information obtained, this was the highest number of students serviced at any one school. Furthermore, the number of parents (N=50) seen by psychological personnel was higher than at any other school.

Educational Development Corporation (EDC): Fulton, Kelly and Wister Schools

The three EDC schools contracted services with the Institute for Learning, which, as mentioned earlier, uses a prescriptive remedial approach in helping teachers and parents deal with learning problems. Across all three schools, 54 children were seen on an individual basis and were under treatment or consultation.

Florida Parent: Kearny and Nebinger Schools

The Kearny school contracted psychological services with Hahnemann Mental Health Center. Services performed by the psychologists included classroom observations, teacher consultations, parent interviews and psychometric or psychoeducational diagnoses. Although 18 children were examined for psychological problems. no information on follow-up treatment was provided.

The Nebinger school did not have a psychological contract, but utilized Hall-Mercer's Child Guidance Clinic. Twenty-six (26) children received treatment in this way.

Parent Implemented: Harrison School

The Harrison school had no psychological contract until late in the year, and no information was provided.

Philadelphia Process: Drew, McMichael and Wilson Schools

The three Philadelphia Process Schools contracted psychological services with the Community Mental Health Center of Children's Hospital. A consultant worked with students, teachers and parents in developing strategies for helping children with learning or emotional problems. Across the three schools, approximately 30 children were under individual consultation or treatment.

SOCIAL SERVICES[1]

A. Total Program

As in 1974-1975, 16/18 Follow Through schools were staffed with a Follow Through School Community Coordinator who provided social services to Follow Through children and their families. However, some of these positions were cut from full-time to part-time in the 1975-1976 year. Seven schools also had additional social service personnel for part or all of the school year. The percent of Follow Through families visited during the year ranged from 29% to 100% at each school, and it is estimated that approximately 51% (N=3,603) of the Follow Through population needed help of a social service nature. Of these, 87% were reported to have received help from Follow Through social service personnel.

B. Title I Objectives

Of the 17 schools which provided information on social services, seven schools did not provide figures for one quarter. Nevertheless, 9/17 schools fully satisfied the objective which stipulated that: i) at least 75% of each school's Follow Through families would be visited at least once during the year, and that ii) 50% of those families identified as in need of help, would be helped. In addition, the remaining 8 schools met the second criterion, i.e., at least 50% of those in need of help, received help.

1. All results reported in this section can be found in Table 4 of the Appendix.

C. Level of Services by Model

Bank Street: Dunbar, Elverson and E. M. Stanton Schools

Each of the Bank Street schools was staffed with a Follow Through School Community Coordinator. In addition, the Elverson school utilized parent scholars to make home visits. Although Elverson provided information for only part of the year, 100% of the Follow Through population was visited at least once, and 171 families (39%) received help of a social service nature. At Dunbar 60% of the population was visited at least once and 72 families (27%) received help, while at E. M. Stanton 71% of the population was visited and 41 families (13%) received help.

Behavior Analysis: Arthur, Duckrey and Pratt-Arnold Schools

Duckrey was the only Behavior Analysis school which did not have a Follow Through School Community Coordinator, although one of two regular School Community Coordinators services Follow Through families. Pratt-Arnold also contracted the services of a social worker for one day per week. The percentage of families visited at least once was 80% at Arthur, 100% at Duckrey, and 90% at Pratt-Arnold. The number of families who received help of a social service nature was 218 (78%) at Arthur, 151 (26%) at Duckrey and 575 (83%) at Pratt-Arnold.

Bilingual: Ferguson, Ludlow and Waring Schools

Although all three schools were staffed with a Follow Through School Community Coordinator, the Waring coordinator is hampered by the fact that he does not speak Spanish, which explains the low figures for this school. The percentage of families visited at least once was 75% at Ferguson, 99% at Ludlow and 29% at Waring. The number of families helped was 21 (7%) at Ferguson, 54 (13%) at Ludlow, and 4 (1%) at Waring.

EDC: Fulton, Kelly and Wister Schools

The three EDC schools each had a Follow Through School Community Coordinator, as well as the services of a Family Services Specialist (shared by the three schools) for approximately five months of the school year. The percentage of families visited during the year was 46% at Fulton, 42% at Kelly and 90% at Wister, while the number of families helped was 148 (29%) at Fulton, 66 (21%) at Kelly, and 227 (37%) at Wister.

Florida Parent: Kearny, Nebinger Schools

The Kearny school did not have a Follow Through School Community Coordinator, but the regular Community Coordinator indicated that all Follow Through families were visited; although no further information was provided. At Nebinger, an estimated 50% of Follow Through families were visited at least once, and 94 families (28%) received help.

Parent Implemented: Harrison School

Although the Harrison School had a Follow Through School Community Coordinator, the information reported for the year was imcomplete. However, on the basis of the information provided, 85% of the Follow Through population was visited at least once, and 285 families (87%) were given help of a social service nature.

Philadelphia Process: Drew, McMichael and Wilson Schools

All three Philadelphia Process schools were staffed with a Follow Through School Community Coordinator. However, the Drew School provided no information on this component. One hundred percent (100%) of the Follow Through families at McMichael and 90% at Wilson were visited at least once during the year. It was reported that 532 families (100%) received help at McMichael and 482 (100%) at Wilson. These figures seem to be inflated.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT[1]

A. Total Program

The following information underestimates the degree of parent involvement in the program during the 1975-1976 year, due to the fact that 5 schools did not provide information for the months of April and May, and one school did not provide information for the entire year. Based on the available data, 3,340 parents helped with PAC related activities as compared with 4,213 in the previous year. It should be noted, however, that these numbers are aggregates from quarterly reporting forms which do not indicate whether the same or different parents were involved each quarter.

Similarly, 7,086 parents attended either PAC, Follow Through-related or school meetings during the year as compared with 8,117 in the previous year, and the number of volunteer hours donated to the program by parents totaled 19,615 as compared with 47,853 in 1974-1975. Although these comparisons are tentative, the drop in the number of volunteer hours appears to be significant.

B. Title I Objectives

Of the 17/18 Follow Through schools which reported information on this component, 15 satisfied the first criterion of the first objective which stipulated that the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) at each school would involve at least 15 other parents monthly in committee work to plan parent activities, and 10/17 schools satisfied the second criterion which stipulated that the PAC at each school would work jointly with at least two community action groups on projects in the course of a year.

1. All results reported in this section can be found in Table 5 of the Appendix.

The second objective for parent involvement stipulated that at least: i) 10% of the parent population at each school would attend a PAC-related meeting monthly, ii) 20% would attend a Follow Through-related meeting or affair monthly, and iii) 70% would attend one school meeting or affair during the school year. This objective was not fully met at any of the 17 schools. However, it was partially met at 10 schools where one or two of the three criteria were fully met, and at least 50% of the required percentage on the remaining criterion or criteria was met.

The third objective stipulated that at least one hour of parent volunteer time monthly would be donated to the program to match the number of children in the program. This objective was not attained by the project as a whole. Only 1/16 schools which reported volunteer hours, met this objective. Four schools partially met the objective by providing 0.5 to 0.7 hours per pupil monthly.

C. Level of Parent Involvement by Model

Bank Street: Dunbar, Elverson and E. M. Stanton Schools

The executive PAC's at all three Bank Street schools were successful in involving at least 15 other parents monthly in committee work to plan parent activities. The percentage of parents who attended PAC or Follow Through-related meetings monthly was 17% at Dunbar, 6% at Elverson and 17% at E. M. Stanton. The percentage of parents who attended at least one school meeting or affair during the year was 75% at Dunbar, 45% at Elverson and 81% at E. M. Stanton. Parent volunteer time averaged 15 to 20 minutes per pupil monthly at each of the three schools.

Behavior Analysis: Arthur, Duckrey and Pratt-Arnold Schools

The executive PAC's at all three Behavior Analysis schools were successful in involving at least 22 parents monthly in committee work to plan parent activities. The percentage of parents who attended PAC or Follow Through-related meetings monthly was 20% at Arthur, 5% at Duckrey and 3% at Pratt-Arnold. The percentage of parents who attended at least one school meeting or affair during the year was 50% at Arthur, 48% at Duckrey and 31% at Pratt-Arnold. Parent volunteer time averaged 15 to 20 minutes per pupil monthly at the three schools.

Bilingual: Ferguson, Ludlow and Waring Schools

The executive PAC's at all three Bilingual schools succeeded in involving at least 15 parents monthly in committee work to plan parent activities. The percentage of parents who attended PAC or Follow Through-related meetings monthly was 7% at Ferguson, 13% at Ludlow and 17% at Waring. The percentage of parents who attended at least one school meeting or affair during the year was 80% at Ferguson, 75% at Ludlow and 100% at Waring. Parent volunteer time averaged 40 minutes per pupil monthly at Ferguson, and 10 to 15 minutes per pupil at Ludlow and Waring.

EDC: Fulton, Kelly and Wister Schools

The executive PAC's at all three EDC schools succeeded in involving at least 20 parents monthly in committee work to plan parent activities. The percentage of parents who attended PAC or Follow Through-related meetings monthly was 4% at Fulton, 6% at Kelly and 13% at Wister. The percentage of parents who attended at least one school meeting or affair during the year was 37% at Fulton, 43% at Kelly and 100% at Wister.

Parent volunteer time averaged 25 to 30 minutes per pupil monthly at Fulton and Wister. The Kelly school provided no information regarding volunteer time.

Florida Parent: Kearny and Nebinger Schools

The executive PAC at Nebinger involved 10 other parents monthly in committee work to plan parent activities, whereas Kearny involved 21 other parents. The percentage of parents who attended PAC or Follow Through-related meetings monthly was 7% at Nebinger and 10% at Kearny. The percentage of parents who attended at least one school meeting or affair during the year was 61% at Nebinger and 80% at Kearny. Parent volunteer time averaged 40 minutes per pupil monthly at Nebinger and 15 minutes per pupil at Kearny.

Parent Implemented: Harrison School

The executive PAC at Harrison succeeded in involving 14 parents monthly in committee work to plan parent activities. Seventeen percent (17%) of the parents attended PAC or Follow Through-related meetings monthly, and 80% attended at least one school meeting or affair during the year. Parent volunteer time averaged 1 hour per pupil monthly.

Philadelphia Process: Drew, McMichael and Wilson Schools

The Drew school provided no information on this component. However, the Wilson executive PAC was able to involve 22 other parents monthly in committee work to plan parent activities, but the McMichael school was able to involve only 2 additional parents monthly. The percentage of parents who attended PAC or Follow Through-related meetings monthly was 3% at McMichael and 10% at Wilson. The percentage of parents who attended at least one school meeting or affair during the year was 18% at McMichael and 100% at Wilson. Parent volunteer time averaged 15 minutes per pupil monthly at McMichael and 30 minutes per pupil at Wilson.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Due to incomplete information as enumerated on p.p. 2, 5, 12, and 15 it is difficult to assess the level of medical services provided to Follow Through children in the 1975-1976 year. However, available data indicate that of the approximately 4,500 children screened, 28% (N=1,254) were referred for care and of these children 51% (N=634) received treatment. Escort and transportation services dimished in comparison with previous years due to increased personnel costs.

For similar reasons the level of dental services is also difficult to assess, but available data indicate that of the 4,298 children screened for dental problems, 39% (N=1,670) were referred for care and 44% of these children (N=742) received treatment. Escort and transportation services were somewhat better provided for than for medical services.

Psychological services have dwindled over the years due to the shifting of funds to meet increased personnel costs. Less than 4% of the Follow Through population received direct psychological services, although staff development for teachers probably provided indirect services to a larger percentage of children.

Social services diminished somewhat, in that fewer Follow Through School Community Coordinators were hired on a full-time basis. Home visits numbered 8,770 as compared with 9,396 in the previous year and 3,603 families were helped in 1975-1976 as compared with 4,968 in 1974-1975.

Information for parent involvement was incomplete for some schools, but available data indicate that the number of parents who helped the executive PAC at each school in planning parent activities amounted to 401 parents monthly for

the total program. Nine of the 18 schools succeeded in having at least 70% of their Follow Through parent population attend one school meeting or affair during the year and the number of parent volunteer hours totaled 19,615, although this figure represents a significant drop from the 1974-1975 year.

In conclusion, although incomplete data due to a number of problems already discussed in this report render the following statements tentative, it would appear that each of the program components have suffered from increased personnel costs, and that the level of supportive services has consequently decreased, as well as the high level of parent involvement.

TABLE 1

MEDICAL SERVICES FOR TOTAL FOLLOW THROUGH IN 1975-76

School And Total Program	Follow Through Population K-4	Medical Agency Providing Services	Contract?	No. Vision Screenings By School Nurse		No. Growth Screenings By School Nurse		No. Audio Screenings By School Nurse		No. Chn. Referred For Care (% of Tot. Pop)		No. Chn. Under Care (% under care who were referred)		No. Chn. Where Care Was Completed (% of those who were referred)		No. Chn. Taken By School Personnel	No. Chn. Transported By School
	N			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N
Dunbar [a]	269	Jefferson	YES	128	48	128	48	40	15	20	7	16	80	15	75	0	0
Elverson [a]	437	Jefferson	YES	307	70	307	70	381	87	7	2	2	29	2	29	0	0
E.M.Stanton	321	REBOUND	NO	N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		--	--
Arthur	281	REBOUND	NO	264	94	143	51	225	80	7	2	7	100	0	0	0	0
Duckrey	578	Jefferson	YES	508	88	508	88	508	88	167	29	73	44	111	66	0	0
Pratt-A.	689	Jefferson	YES	402	58	332	48	539	78	243	35	114	47	48	20	0	0
Ferguson [a]	286	Jefferson	YES	170	59	133	47	N.I.		51	18	29	57	27	53	0	0
Ludlow [a]	403	St. Luke's	YES	94	23	94	23	204	51	69	17	66	96	N.I.		147	0
Waring [a]	494		NO	564	100	564	100	294	60	40	8	21	52	3	8	0	0
Fulton	504	Covenant H.	YES	292	58	228	45	195	39	55	11	10	18	45	82	0	0
Kelly	314	Covenant H.	YES	304	97	176	56	272	87	24	8	16	66	28	100	2	2
Wister	610	Covenant H.	YES	604	99	604	99	501	82	180		180	100	180	100	4	0
Nebinger	335	SENHC	YES	238	71	244	73	250	72	130	39	25	19	25	100	0	0
Kearny [a]	130	Health Cr.6	NO	80	62	80	62	4	3	151	100	15	10	15	100	0	0
Harrison [a]	327	Jefferson	YES	181	55	181	55	86	26	36	11	25	69	18	50	0	0
Drew [b]	168	Pres. Hosp.	YES	150	89	N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.	N.I.
McMichael	520	Pres. Hosp.	YES	459	88	338	65	393	76	74	14	35	47	N.I.		0	0
Wilson	345	Pres. Hosp.	YES	220	64	220	64	280	81	N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.	N.I.
Total F.T.	7011		14contracts	4965	71	4280	60	4200	60	1254	18	634	51	517	41	153	0

a. Information provided only for a 6 month period.

b. Information provided only for a 3 month period.

TABLE 2

DENTAL SERVICES FOR FOLLOW THROUGH SEPT.-1975-MAY 1976

School And Total Program	Follow Through Population K-4	Contract	Agency	No. School Dental Screenings For Dental Problems		No. Children Referred For Dental Care (% of Total Population)		No. Children Under Care (% under care who were referred)		No. Children Who Completed Care (% completed care who were referred)		No. Chn. Taken To Dental Services	No. Chn. Transported
	N			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N
Dunbar	269	YES	Priv. Dentist	208	77	100	37	100	100	46	46	50	50
Elverson [a]	437	YES	Priv. Dentist	367	84	131	30	134	100	72	55	72	50
E.M. Stanton	321	NO	REBOUND	N.I.		103	32	N.I.		N.I.		N.I.	N.I.
Arthur [a]	281	NO	REBOUND	264	94	14	5	14	100	14	100	0	0
Duckrey	578	NO	Health Ctr. St. Christ.	646	100	340	59	40	12	28	8	14	0
Pratt-Arnold	689	NO	Diamond St. Medical Ctr.	500	73	201	29	35	17	28	14	28	0
Ferguson	286	NO	City Dental Clinic	402	100	143	50	12	8	12	100	0	0
Ludlow	403	YES	Priv. Dentist	196	49	196	49	223	100	48	24	105	0
Waring [b]	494	NO	Health Ctr.	239	48	129	26	19	15	N.I.		11	0
Fulton	504	YES	Priv. Dentist	572	100	13	3	16	100	18	100	0	0
Kelly	314	YES	Priv. Dentist	N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.	N.I.
Wister	610	YES	Priv. Dentist	N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.	N.I.
Nebinger	335	YES	SENHC	250	75	58	17	57	98	0		39	30
Kearny [a]	130	NO	Fairmount Health Center	80	62	40	31	40	100	6	15	25	0
Harrison [a]	327	YES	Priv. Dentist	N.I.		64	20	32	50	42	66	11	0
Drew	168	YES	U. of P. Dental School	N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.		N.I.	N.I.
McMichael [a]	520	YES	U. of P. Dental School	326	63	129	25	15	12	6	5	7	0
Wilson	345	YES	U. of P. Dental School	248	72	9	3	5	55	4	44	8	0
Total Program	7011	11 schools		4298	61	1670	24	742	44	324	19	370	130

a. Information provided only for a 6 month period.

b. Information provided only for a 3 month period.

PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES IN FOLLOW THROUGH - SEPT. 1975 - MAY 1976

Schools and Total Program	Follow Through Population	Contracted Services	Agency	No. Referred to Psych. Personnel	No. Chn. Examined (% of Chn. examined who were referred)		No. Chn. Under Treatmt./Consultation		No. Chn. Who Completed Treatment	No. Parents Seen By Psych. Personnel
				N	N	%	N	%	N	N
BANK STREET										
Dunbar	269	YES	Private Consultant	14	14	100	N.I.		N.I.	3
Elverson	437	YES	Private Consultant	20	17	85	N.I.		N.I	1
E.M. Stanton	321	NO	Rebound	N.I.	N.I.		N.I.		N.I	N.I
BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS										
Arthur	281	NO	Child Guidance Jef. MH Clinic	N.I	N.I.		N.I.		N.I	N.I
Duckrey [a]	578	NO	North Central MH/MR Unit	7	2	28	1	50	N.I	1
Pratt-A.	689	NO	E.P.P.I	33	18	54	13	72	1	15
BILINGUAL										
Ferguson	286	YES	Inst. For Learning	19	16	84	16	100	3	11
Ludlow	403	YES	Temple Univ. Coll. of Educ.	86	58	67	58	100	14	50
Waring	494	YES	Inst. For Learning	27	18	67	18	100	14	10
EDC										
Fulton	504	YES	Inst. For Learning	30	20	67	20	100	16	14
Kelly	314	YES	Inst. For Learning	13	13	100	10	76	2	4
Wister	610	YES	Inst. For Learning	32	24	75	24	100	2	8
FLORIDA PARENT										
Nebinger	335	NO	Child Guidance Hall-Mercer	26	26	100	26	100	N.I	26
Kearny	130	YES	Hahnemann MH/MR	24	18	75	N.I.		N.I	7
PARENT INPL.										
Harrison	327	YES	Private Consultant	N.I	N.I..		N.I.		N.I	N.I
PHILA. PROCESS										
Drew	168	YES	Community MH Of P.P.C.	18	18	100	18	100	N.I.	10
McMichael	520	YES	Community MH Of P.P.C.	5	5	100	5	100	2	N.I
Wilson [b]	345	YES	Community MH Of P.P.C.	9	8	89	7	87	7	35
Total Program	7011	13 schools		363	275	76	216	79	65	195

a. Information provided for only September to February
b. Information provided for only March to May

TABLE 4

SOCIAL SERVICES FOR FOLLOW THROUGH, SEPT. 1975-MAY 1976

Schools And Total Program	Follow Through Population	Follow Through Coordinator At School	Total No. Home Visits	Estimated % visited at least once	No. of Families identified as needing help	No. Families Given Help		% Helped Who Needed Help
	N		N	%	N	N	%	
Dunbar	269	YES	162	60	27	72	27	100
Elverson[b]	437	YES	564	100	192	171	39	89
E.M. Stanton	321	YES	227	71	34	41	13	100
Arthur	281	YES	568	80	189	218	78	100
Duckrey	578	NO	794	100	192	151	26	79
Pratt-A.[a]	689	YES	673	90	861[c]	575[c]	83	67
Ferguson	286	YES	602	75	25	21	7	84
Ludlow	403	YES	858	99	65	54	13	83
Waring[b]	494	YES	143	29	3	4	8	100
Fulton	504	YES	355	46	150	148	29	99
Kelly[b]	314	YES	133	42	68	66	21	97
Wister[b]	610	YES	546	90	247	227	37	92
Kearny[b]	130	NO	183	100	N.I	N.I.		N.I.
Nebinger	335	YES	467	50	126	94	28	50
Drew	168	YES	N.I.	N.I	N.I	N.I		N.I.
Harrison[b]	327	YES	754	85	226	285	87	100
McMichael[a b]	520	YES	839	100	594[c]	532[c]	100	90
Wilson[a]	345	YES	902	90	604[c]	482[c]	100	80
Total Program	7011		8770	29-100	3603	3141	45	87

a. A social worker was contracted for one day per week at these schools.

b. Partial information only.

c. These figures appear to be inflated.

TABLE 5

PARENT INVOLVEMENT FOR FOLLOW THROUGH, SEPT. 1975 - MAY 1976

School And Total Program	Follow Through Population	No. of Parents Who Helped With PAC		Number of Parents Who Attended Meetings						No. of Parent Scholars		Volunteer Hours		Worked Jointly with Two Community Groups
				PAC		FT-Related		Any Meetings						
		Tot. Yr.	Mthly.	Tot. Yr.	Mthly %	Tot. Yr.	Mthly %	Tot. Yr.	% Tot. Yr (Estim)[c]	Tot. Yr.	Mthly.	Tot. Yr.	Mth.	
Dunbar	269	144	16	164	7	422	17	703	75	16	2	755	.31	YES
Elverson[a]	437	191	27	147	5	195	6	195	45	42	7	790	.26	YES
E.M. Stanton	321	133	15	240	8	485	17	485	81	32	4	1051	.36	YES--one group
Arthur	281	255	28	249	10	513	20	673	50	102	11	612	.24	YES--one group
Duckrey	578	195	22	243	5	279	5	279	48	197	21	1675	.32	NO
Pratt-A.	689	214	24	172	3	214	3	214	31	177	19	1709	.28	YES
Ferguson	286	135	15	139	5	193	7	382	80	51	6	1769	.68	NO
Ludlow	403	461	51	181	5	480	13	480	75	64	6	678	.19	YES
Waring[a]	494	184	26	201	5	599	17	599	100	21	3	916	.26	YES
Fulton	504	177	20	185	4	184	4	193	37	22	2	1963	.43	YES
Kelly[a]	314	149	21	135	6	135	6	135	43	14	2	N.I		YES
Wister[a]	610	472	67	302	7	557	13	624	100	44	11	2315	.54	YES
Nebinger	335	90	10	135	4	203	7	203	61	81+	11+	155	.66	NO
Kearny	130	190	21	93	8	116	10	228	80	86	9	314	.27	YES--one group
Harrison	327	130	14	377	13	508	17	810	80	99	11	3129	1.06	YES
Drew[b]	168	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	N.I.	NO INFORMATION
McMichael[a]	520	18	2	88	2	94	3	94	18	112	18	861	.24	YES--one group
Wilson	345	202	22	313	10	326	10	789	100	100	11	923	.54	YES
Total Program	7011	3340	401	3364	2-13	5503	3-20	7086	18-100	1260	154	19615	.32	10 schools

a. Information for April and May not submitted

b. No information provided.

c. Since a considerable overlap occurs from quarter to quarter (i.e., the same parents are often included) it was necessary to obtain an estimated percentage.

MEDICAL SERVICES 1975-76
March-May

School _____

Which agency provides medical services
to Follow Through children? _____

Is the agency (circle which applies) Contracted or Non-contracted?

No. of children screened for vision by school nurse _____

No. of children screened for growth by school nurse _____

No. of children screened for audio problems by school nurse _____

No. of children screened for other problems by school nurse _____

Please specify type of screening _____

_____

No. of children who were found to have medical problems? _____

	Contracted	Non-contracted
No. of children referred for care	_____	_____
No. of children under care	_____	_____
No. of children where care has been completed	_____	_____

If the school provides an escort to medical services, how many children were taken by school personnel? _____

If the school provides transportation, how many children were transported? _____

DENTAL SERVICES 1975-76
March-May

School _____

Agency (or private dentist) which provides dental services to Follow Through children? _____

Is the agency (circle which applies) Contracted or Non-contracted?

No. of children screened by school dental staff for dental problems _____

No. of children found to have dental problems _____

	Contracted	Non-contracted
No. of children referred for care	_____	_____
No. of children under care	_____	_____
No. of children where care has been completed	_____	_____

If the school provides an escort to dental services, how many children were taken by school personnel? _____

If the school provides transportation, how many children were transported? _____

PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES, 1975-1976
March-May

Which agency provides services to Follow Through children? _____

Is the agency (circle which applies) Contracted or Non-contracted?

	Contracted	Non-contracted
Number of children referred to psychological personnel	_____	_____
Number of children examined	_____	_____
Number of children under treatment or consultation	_____	_____
Number of children where treatment completed	_____	_____
Number of parents seen by psychological personnel	_____	_____

Other activities conducted by psychological personnel. Please specify

_____

_____

_____

QUARTERLY REPORT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
IN FOLLOW THROUGH, 1975-1976

School _____

Total number of Follow Through families _____

Is there a Follow Through School Community Coordinator at the school?

(Please circle) Yes No

Is anyone else contracted to provide social services to Follow Through families?

(Please circle) Yes No

If yes, please specify: _____

	April	May
1. Number of Follow Through families visited		
2. Number of Follow Through families who needed help of a social service nature		
3. Number of Follow Through families who were given help by FT Coordinator or FT social service personnel (e.g., help with families problems or help with using social service agencies)		

4. Please estimate the percentage of Follow Through families who received at least one home visit for the total year. _____

5. Please estimate the percentage of Follow Through families who were given help during the year. _____

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PARENT INVOLVEMENT
IN FOLLOW THROUGH, 1975-1976

School _____

Total Number of Follow Through Families _____

	April	May
1. Number of Executive PAC members (include parents on PAC committees)		
2. Number of Parents who helped with PAC activities		
3. Number of Parents from your school who attended PAC meetings (either school, district or city-wide)		
4. Number of Parents who attended <u>any</u> Follow Through meeting or affair (including PAC meetings)		
5. Number of Follow Through parents who attended <u>any</u> meeting or affair at the school (not necessarily Follow Through-related)		
6. Number of Parent Scholars involved in the program		
7. Number of Volunteer Parents		
8. Number of hours of volunteer time		

9. Did the PAC group work in conjunction with any community groups?

<u>Yes</u> <u>No</u> (Please circle)

If yes, please specify which groups and for what purpose:

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Please estimate for <u>the total year</u> the percentage of Follow Through parents who attended any meeting or affair at the school. _____